

I believe that Congress and the American people are owed an explanation of what really happened in this situation and why.

The article follows:

(By John T. O'Rourke)

Another big lie—or something so like one that it is almost impossible to tell the difference—about the White House's role in the Cuban invasion disaster was unveiled for public view yesterday.

Until yesterday, members of the Cuban Revolutionary Council have been publicly silent on the following questions:

1. Whether or not they were told that President Kennedy had altered at the last minute, by refusing to permit U.S. air cover, the original plan which provided it.

2. Whether or not they approved the change.

3. Whether or not they decided to go forward with the invasion anyhow.

It has been the administration line to imply that the decision rested with the Cuban leaders, and that they had decided to go ahead.

DENIAL

Dr. Antonio de Varona, one of the Revolutionary Council leaders and speaking in its name, yesterday categorically denied all three points.

He says:

1. They were not told that President Kennedy had basically altered the plan by refusing to let U.S. airplanes cover the landing.

2. That therefore they never approved the change, since they didn't know about it.

3. That they never were given the opportunity of deciding whether or not to invade, or even what its schedule was.

Dr. Varona states that neither he nor any other member of the Revolutionary Council was told when or where the invasion would occur.

This has been the private position of the Council since the disaster, but all members of it were reluctant to place themselves in controversy with the administration on these points because until recently they were never flatly stated in public.

NOW IT'S OUT

What tore it was a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post, which, while critical, pretty effectively bailed out President Kennedy and put the onus on the Council for going ahead with President Kennedy's emasculated version of the invasion.

Two weeks ago, in the Satevepost, Stewart Alsop wrote:

"The next day (April 5) Kennedy called a meeting at his office attended by Rusk (Secretary of State), McNamara (Secretary of Defense) and Allen Dulles (head of the CIA). At this meeting Kennedy made his decision to go ahead with the operation.

"But he ruled, under no circumstances whatever would American forces become involved.

"Moreover, the Cuban leaders must be categorically warned in advance of this decision. Berle (special State Department official) and Schlesinger (White House aid) were accordingly sent to New York to inform the Cuban leaders who unanimously voted to go ahead with the plan regardless."

TOO MUCH

Apparently the Council members believe Satevepost Editor Alsop was fed this by the White House, that it is too much for them to take, and they have decided to break silence and officially challenge it.

And so yesterday, in a letter to Mr. Alsop, Dr. Varona simply said it wasn't so. He sent a copy of it to the publisher of Miami's Spanish language newspaper, which was the first to publish it. It said:

"You incur * * * error, due surely to inaccurate information, in stating that the Cuban revolutionary leaders approved the invasion plans in spite of the fact that we (were) informed by Messrs. Berle and Schlesinger that the U.S. Government would not offer us the necessary military aid.

"That statement is against the truth; for which reason I find myself forced to declare that at no time were we advised that the Cuban patriots would lack the promised air and naval protection, nor were we informed of the date and place of the landing."

Dr. Varona concluded his letter by saying: "I leave to historians the delicate task of judging the facts and attributing the responsibilities."

Dr. Varona's son was in the ill-fated invasion force, as were the sons of several other council members, including the son of Dr. Jose Miro Cardona, the council's chairman and the prospective provisional president if the attempt had succeeded.

THEY'RE UNANIMOUS

All members of the council had previously told Scripps-Howard representatives and other Washington newspapermen that they not only were unaware of what the CIA had afoot, but that they were virtual prisoners of the CIA during the entire disaster. They were flown from Miami to Washington, from Washington to New York, driven around Long Island in cars and then to Philadelphia and finally flown from there to a marine base at Opalaca, Fla., where they were held in what might be called protective custody during the fatal day.

THE FIRST NEWS

They were held in the base's bachelor officers' quarters and in its lounge first heard about the invasion when one of the council turned on the radio.

Frantic with anxiety, they demanded to be taken to President Kennedy. Dr. Varona threatened to try to get through the marine guard at the gates, challenging them to shoot him. He was dissuaded when he was promised that a special emissary from the White House was being sent to them.

This turned out to be an Army colonel, who gave them the bad news direct.

MORE CONTRADICTIONS

There are other mysteries still unexplained by Mr. Alsop's version of the disaster. For instance, Mr. Alsop says, "By early March, on Kennedy's insistence, an alternative plan had been devised. This plan called for air strikes, to be billed for world consumption as the work of defectors from the Castro air force, but were actually to be mounted from Guatemalan bases and piloted by refugee pilots."

Mr. Alsop calls this Kennedy's plan.

So that there can be no misunderstanding, he says further on * * * "As we have seen, an essential part of the Kennedy plan was the knocking out of Castro's tiny air force by the 16 Guatemalan-based B-26 bombers supplied to the rebels by the CIA."

But then he says: "The President had given orders that nothing should be done to impair the credibility of American Ambassador to the U.N. Adlai Stevenson. In other words, Stevenson should not be lied to, and should not be asked to lie. Stevenson was aware of these orders. Thus when he heard from the State Department that the pilots of the April 15 air strike actually were defectors, he believed it.

"When he heard, too late, that a State Department underling had been stupid and the defection story was a lie he was understandably furious and demanded that there be no more of this sort of thing."

CALLED OFF

So the President then called off the second strike, which was to have taken place just before the landings, and finish off what Castro planes had survived the first strike.

The idea that the President planned a fake air strike, and that every high official involved knew it was a fake, including the Secretaries of State and Defense and the head of the CIA, but not the President's close personal adviser and Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, who wasn't informed because the President didn't want him to lie about it (which he then did) stretches the credibility of the jaded newsgatherer in far-out executive ineptitude practically to the point of no return.

Cuban Communism and Its Threat to the Americas—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the continuation of the speech by Mr. Hall Allen, editor in chief of the Palm Beach Post Times, to the Palm Beach Chapter of the National Secretaries Association concerning the threat of Castro communism to the American states. Additional sections will be printed during the next few days:

CUBAN COMMUNISM AND ITS THREAT TO THE AMERICAS—PART 3

The destructive influence of the Communists in the Cuban Government on the rights of the Cuban people has not been confined to the monied class and the professional groups. The working classes have been harshly brought to heel too.

An example: Several months ago electrical workers in Havana staged a march on the presidential palace to protest against reductions in their standard of living. A few days later Castro denounced them for their actions. Soon after that, a power failure occurred in Havana. Three electrical workers were arrested as saboteurs and executed.

The question has been asked many times over as to why the recent invasion attempt to overthrow Castro failed so completely—why it didn't receive popular support of the Cuban people?

From the best information available, the answer seems to be that grossly inadequate coordination of effort was largely responsible for the failure.

And, at the same time, the same grossly inadequate coordination made it practically impossible to achieve the sorely needed popular support of the Cuban people.

There seems no question but that our CIA—which masterminded the entire project—blundered in its analysis of the immediate reaction of the Cuban people to the invasion. It apparently underestimated terribly the grip of terror in which the Cuban people were held.

It apparently underestimated terribly the extent of Cuba's military armaments and the ability of Castro's army and people's militia to use weapons.

It apparently underestimated terribly—and this is the most unforgivable error of all—the vital need for close coordination of the invasion with the anti-Castro underground. I am reliably informed that underground leaders who for weeks had been disrupting things in Cuba with bombings and arson had absolutely no advance knowledge that the invasion was being launched. They were not called upon to blow up bridges,

beat upon our shores and threaten us in a fashion never before faced by Americans.

And so, it is appropriate that on this day we pause and rededicate ourselves to that spirit and that motivation which was in the hearts and minds of those who on July 4, 1776, signed the Declaration of Independence.

At the time this document was wrought, that little group of citizens was challenged by the power of other nations which far exceeded their few rifles, their sparse ammunition, their paltry numbers. They were faced with what appeared to be an unfriendly, a cold, an inhospitable land; and the total picture for them was one of hardship, struggle, and sacrifice, if they were to achieve that freedom which they sought.

But their spirit, their dedication, their courage knew no obstacles. It was all eloquently summed up in the clarion cry of Patrick Henry, of Virginia, when in the Virginia Convention at Richmond (March 23, 1775), he said, "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

This was the spirit which birthed this great nation and, ladies and gentlemen, this is the spirit which we now need throughout America tonight, and tomorrow, and for the days ahead.

In 1776 there was no tendency on the part of those willing to make their "decision for freedom" to endlessly debate, to negotiate, to equivocate, or to back up. They knew what they wanted; they knew of its importance to their welfare and they were willing to make total sacrifice, if need be, in order to get it.

I am greatly disturbed that there is growing up in America today in the face of encircling and encroaching dictatorship, a so-called cult of the status quo—a group of people who somehow believe that in the final analysis, the enemy must somehow be reasonable, fair, and prudent.

Those who belong to the cult of the status quo which is made up primarily of editorial writers, columnists, politicians, and certain dreamy but well-intentioned private citizens, have the belief that if we do nothing about the growing strength, the growing encroachments and challenges of the enemy, somehow it will disappear. Somehow crawl under a rug and hide. In essence, they argue, do nothing now—for it will go away later.

This group, the cult of the status quo, the nonactivists the hands-off set, argue that it is most unfortunate that Cuba has fallen into the hands of the Communist conspiracy, but we must not become hysterical about it. In fact, we must not do anything. For, if we were to act decisively we might frighten someone or appear to have bad manners. They claim it is virtuous and intelligent to be restrained and polite and somehow learn to live with these problems.

The New York Times, just last week said in an editorial that the United States must recognize that Cuba is a communistic state with sovereignty and independence, and that we in the United States must now learn to get along with it.

Ladies and gentlemen, in my humble judgment, this is dangerous sophistry. We cannot abandon Cuba to the Communists. We cannot consider Cuba as lost or as unimportant, or of no major concern to us.

While it is true that at this moment the issue of Berlin seems to be, and undoubtedly is, a more dangerous and explosive problem than that of Cuba, nevertheless I cannot agree with those respected Senators, Congressmen, writers, and private citizens, who say that Cuba is on the periphery or the outskirts of our problem and, therefore, we should make no immediate plans to bring about its liberation.

Recently, in a speech at the University of California, Pedro Beltran, Prime Minister of Peru, warned—

"If the United States does not step forward now with dynamic leadership to meet the unceasing conspiracy . . . of the Soviet Union and Red China, Latin America is lost. And if Latin America, with all its 200 million people, is lost, so also is the United States.

"And would it not be tragic if the United States won the Congo, secured Berlin, triumphed in Laos, Ghana, and the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, while in the end a victorious Communist thrust for power took place in the heart of its own hemisphere?"

He said to us—"You could have won, thousands of miles away, and yet been beaten by the Kremlin in your own block."

He went on to add, "This hypothetical case, which you here suppose to be impossible is, unfortunately, not impossible south of the Rio Grande, in your sister Republics of Latin America."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the pattern of postponement of decision which brought into existence Red China. This is the pattern of nonaction, which let Hitler get a running start. They follow a course of reasoning which first says—because we are intelligent, and therefore realists, let's recognize that the problem (such as communism in Cuba) exists, thereafter, because to act precipitously would appear emotional and uneducated—we must endlessly debate, while learning to tolerate that condition. Then, in time, because we've grown accustomed to the problem, the process then calls for one of acceptance of the condition in fact, if not in law.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot sit still in this struggle between communism and freedom. There is no status quo in this conflict any more than there is status quo in life itself.

Things just do not stand still; either they grow, they emerge, they flourish, or they diminish, they die, they disappear. And they do one or the other, depending upon the determination, the energy, the direction applied by the people who are concerned.

I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that we must be realists. We must not commit ourselves to that which we cannot do; but I firmly believe that we can and we must meet the growing threat of communism, not only with economic programs and educational programs, but with strength and courage where the situation demands it.

Consequently, in the light of the inevitable upcoming confrontations between the free world and the Communists, I deeply believe we must immediately begin to rally our physical strength for what are to be perilous and difficult days ahead.

It has already been demonstrated, beyond the peradventure of a doubt that, even with all our money, we cannot purchase friendship, and certainly it has been demonstrated that we cannot purchase peace. Surely, after \$71 billion and 15 years of energy, we must have learned that lasting friendships are built upon community of interests, similarity of beliefs and, above all, respect one for the other.

In our anxious efforts to bring about a peaceful disarmament, some 5½ years ago we unilaterally agreed to stop nuclear testing. We undertook that program in an effort to demonstrate our good faith in peaceful solutions of the world's problems. We offered to let the Communists inspect anything that we had, or anything we would do in this field. But we have asked them for 5 years to let us make a similar inspection of their activities. Through weeks, months, and years of wrangling we have been unable to get an agreement from the Communists for any type of bilateral inspection, and obviously the time has now come when in our own self-defense, and to help reestablish our strength and position, we must resume nuclear underground testing.

Winston Churchill once said that the greatest hope for peace lay in the destructive power of the American Strategic Air

Command. Then, in his matchless prose, he said that "in strength lies the only hope for peace." And what a great prophet history has proven him.

Surely, today we are harried and embattled from all sides and all parts of the globe. A look at the map reveals that all over the world, democracy with its high hopes and shining example is nevertheless still losing peoples and countries and struggles, not by choice of the people, but by exploitation, subversion, and brute force.

Surely, the time has now come when we in the United States must be warned by the thunder in the distance. Surely, the time has come when, at least, we must begin to gather our strength and emulate the spirit of those men who affixed their signatures to the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776.

Patriotism is a word we hear much about on this day and other July 4ths. But patriotism must be more than a word—it must be a commitment, an act, a deed, a dedication. And patriotism is the responsibility of every citizen.

The preservation of freedom is not alone the duty of an administration or the responsibility of the few. It is a stern demand made upon each of us. Each of us singly, each of us in common, and each of us as a whole.

Freedom is indivisible. It cannot exist within the partitions of the Western Hemisphere. It cannot survive with faint hearts, apathy, weariness, or debility. It is as strong as each of us is strong.

Let us, therefore, seize this time of stress and this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the eternal revolution of freedom.

For, surely, we want all people to have freedom, as we want all people to have peace—but not peace at any price.

For, surely, peace without liberty, or peace in chains, or peace with unending fear, is not worth having. There are the truisms that our people in 1776 understood. For they had lived with fear and oppression and tyranny. And it was because they understood what was at stake that they sounded the Declaration of Independence whose last sentence proclaimed:

"And for the support of this Declaration, and with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Surely, we who inherited this great tradition of freedom, can today do no less than those who gave it to us.

John F. Kennedy
The Cuban Invasion Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1961

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, another version of the ill-fated Cuban fiasco appeared in the July 13 edition of the Washington Daily News which I would advise my colleagues to read and contemplate.

We have been told through the pages of a national magazine that the free Cuban leaders were well aware of the plans leading up to this abortive invasion attempt, and that they were in on the decision to attempt this invasion without proper air cover.

But an article which follows by John T. O'Rourke refutes this semiofficial position.